



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/760,322

01/16/2004

Joseph J. Kubler

14364US10

2925

23446 7590 04/26/2010
MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD
500 WEST MADISON STREET
SUITE 3400
CHICAGO, IL 60661

EXAMINER

WANG, DAVID

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/26/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/760,322	Applicant(s) KUBLER ET AL.	
	Examiner David Wang	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-85 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-21, 40, 69 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22-39, 41-68, 70-85 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 January 0200 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

NON-FINAL REJECTION AFTER RCE

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, “monitoring the first voice stream for a lack of speech for a minimum period of time” and “ must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Response to Amendment

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. Claims 22, 45, 54 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoppal et al. (US 5,737,331) in view of Kudo et al. (US 5,148,429).

5. Re claim 22, claim 45, and claim 54,

At least one processor (audio processor 56, Hoppal et al. Fig. 5) for processing outgoing digital voice data converted from a first voice stream to produce packets (vocoded voice packets, Hoppal et al. abstract) for transmission via the wireless packet network (Hoppal et al. Fig. 1);

The at least one processor operably coupled to a radio transmitter for transmitting the packets via the wireless packet network (transceiver 44, Hoppal et al. Fig. 4);

The at least one processor operably coupled to a radio receiver for receiving packets via the wireless packet network (transceiver 44, Hoppal et al. Fig. 4);

The at least one processor for selectively processing the packets received via the wireless packet network to produce incoming digital voice data for conversion to a second voice stream (via speech synthesizer 62, Hoppal et al. c6 37-50);

Wherein the phone supports concurrent, bidirectional voice communication (bidirectional audio without significant delay, Hoppal et al. c6 37-50).

Hoppal may not adequately teach monitoring a voice stream for a lack of speech for a minimum period of time. However, Kudo better teaches this limitation:

Wherein the at least one processor monitors the first voice stream for a lack of speech (voice/silence detector, Kudo et al. c4 21-36) for a minimum period of time (predetermined time of silence, Kudo et al. c4 21-36).

Kudo and Hoppal are analogous art, because both references similarly teach voice packets. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to detect voice/silence by Kudo with Hoppal's method for conveying audio signals using digital packets in order to provide a voice data transmission system (Kudo et al. c3 66-2).

Art Unit: 2617

6. Claims 23-24, 26, 30, 41, 49, 55-56, 59, 70 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoppal et al. (US 5,737,331) in view of Kudo et al. (US 5,148,429) as applied to claims 22, 45, 54 above, and further in view of Bertland (US 5,596,573).

7. Re claim 23 (from claim 22), claim 49 (from claim 45), and claim 55 (from claim 54), the prior art may not specifically teach an interface. However, Bertland teaches this limitation such that:

At least one interface for accepting input from a user (address input 3, Bertland Fig. 1).

Bertland is analogous to the prior art, because Bertland similarly teaches digitized voice in a data packet. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of the prior art with Bertland's user interface in order to convert a voice message from analog form to digital form (Bertland c1 55-67).

Bertland further teaches:

The at least one interface for providing feedback to a user (speaker 10, Bertland Fig. 1).

8. Re claim 24 (from claim 23), Bertland further teaches that the interface comprises a keypad (key set, Bertland c3 30-36).

Art Unit: 2617

9. Re claim 26 (from claim 22) and claim 56 (from claim 54), Bertland further teaches:

a handset having a microphone for transducing sound into the first voice stream, and (microphone 2, Bertland Fig. 1)

a transducer for converting the second voice stream into sound (speaker 10, Bertland Fig. 1)

10. Re claim 30 (from claim 22) and claim 59 (from claim 54), Bertland further teaches that the phone transmits and receives packets comprising digital data not related to the establishment or receipt of a voice call (packet-switched digitized voice message, Bertland c1 55-12).

11. Re claim 41 (from claim 22) and claim 70 (from claim 54), Kudo further teaches that the minimum period of time is 40 ms or more, thus constituting approximately 200 milliseconds (Kudo et al. c3 1-4).

12. Claims 42-44, 71-73 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoppal et al. (US 5,737,331) in view of Kudo et al. (US 5,148,429) as applied to claims 22, 45, 54 above, and further in view of Hayata (US 5,553,192).

13. Re claim 42 (from claim 22), the prior art may not adequately teach that the data transmission is interrupted during a lack of speech. However, Hayata teaches that the transmission of packets containing digital voice data is interrupted (transmitter switched

Art Unit: 2617

off, Hayata Fig. 1) when a lack of speech for the minimum period of time is detected (silence, Hayata Fig. 1).

Hayata is analogous to the prior art, because Hayata similarly teaches digitized voice. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to interrupt transmission during a lack of speech (by Hayata) in a communications network (by prior art) wherein discontinuous transmission (DTX) is utilized (Hayata abstract).

14. Re claim 43 (from claim 42) and claim 72 (from claim 54), Hayata further teaches that an indication of a change in speech activity is transmitted following the detection of a lack of speech for the minimum period of time (transmitting BG noise code sequence during silence, Hayata Fig. 1).

15. Re claim 44 (from claim 43) and claim 73 (from claim 72), Hayata further teaches that the indication is a group identifier (the code is grouped per frame, Hayata Fig. 1).

16. Re claim 71 (from claim 54), the prior art may not adequately teach that the data transmission is interrupted during a lack of speech. However, Hayata teaches:

Interrupting transmission of packets containing digital voice data transmitter switched off, Hayata Fig. 1) when a lack of speech for the minimum period of time is detected (silence, Hayata Fig. 1); and

Refraining from interrupting transmission of packets containing digital voice data when a lack of speech for the minimum period of time is not detected (transmitter is not switched off during periods of speech, Hayata Fig. 1).

Hayata is analogous to the prior art, because Hayata similarly teaches digitized voice. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to interrupt transmission during a lack of speech (by Hayata) in a communications network (by prior art) wherein discontinuous transmission (DTX) is utilized (Hayata abstract).

17. Claims 25, 31-32, 36, 47-48, 50, 60-61, 65 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoppal et al. (US 5,737,331) in view of Kudo et al. (US 5,148,429) and Bertland (US 5,596,573) as applied to claims 23, 49, 55 above, and further in view of Dinkins (US 5,678,172).

18. Re claim 25 (from claim 23), Bertland teaches pager systems (Mobitex, Bertland c1 25-36), which include a display, but the prior art may not particularly state a display interface. However, Dinkins teaches that interface comprises a display (display 302, Dinkins Fig. 18A).

Dinkins is analogous to the prior art, because Dinkins similarly teaches voice packets. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of the prior art to include a display interface in a mobile device by Dinkins to increase the “interactivity” of a voice packet messaging system (Dinkins c4 37-44).

19. Re claim 31 (from claim 22), claim 47 (from claim 45), and claim 60 (from claim 54), Dinkins further teaches that the the wireless packet network communicates using an Internet protocol (IP) (Dinkins c9 4-16).

20. Re claim 32 (from claim 31), claim 48 (from claim 47), and claim 61 (from claim 54), Dinkins further teaches that the Internet protocol is the transmission control protocol (TCP/Internet protocol (IP) (Dinkins c9 17-36).

21. Re claim 36 (from claim 22), claim 50 (from claim 45), and claim 65 (from claim 54), Dinkins further teaches an interface (digital display means, Dinkins c13 19-39) for receiving information representing an image for transmission via the wireless packet network (Interactive data appliance IDA can transmit and receive video, Dinkins c2 56-58).

22. Claims 27-28, 57-58 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoppal et al. (US 5,737,331) in view of Kudo et al. (US 5,148,429) as applied to claims 22, 45, 54 above, and further in view of Bergman (US 4,866,704).

23. Re claim 27 (from claim 22) and claim 57 (from claim 54), the prior art may not specifically state a buffer. Nevertheless, Bergman teaches that a processor buffers incoming digital voice data (buffers 26 and 22, Bergman Fig. 4) for an adjustable amount of time (adjusting buffer based on time and bits required, Bergman c6 33-41) to

Art Unit: 2617

avoid the occurrence of a gap in the second voice stream (reconstruct the original continuous communication without gaps, Bergman c6 29-32).

Bergman is analogous to the prior art, because Bergman similarly teaches packetized voice data. Ergo, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Bergman's voice data buffer in a communications network (of prior art) in order to facilitate synchronized transmission (to prevent gaps in communications, Bergman c6 29-32).

24. Re claim 28 (from claim 27) and claim 58 (from claim 54), Bergman further teaches that buffering data for an adjustable amount of time is based upon a propagation delay (transmission latency is typical for a network, Bergman c5 33-47, therefore an elastic buffer is implemented to minimize latency, Bergman c6 20-32).

25. Claim 29 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoppal et al. (US 5,737,331) in view of Kudo et al. (US 5,148,429) and Bergman (US 4,866,704) as applied to claim 27 above, and further in view of Drynan et al. (US 4,617,657).

26. Re claim 29 (from claim 27), the prior art teaches adjusting an elastic buffer for a required amount of time, such as to compensate for a propagation delay. However, the prior art may not specifically teach that the amount of time is based upon a test packet. However, Drynan teaches that the adjustable amount of time is based upon a test packet (measuring a timing delay from a predetermined packet, which is similar to a ping test, Drynan c3 25-32).

Art Unit: 2617

Drynan is analogous to the prior art, because Drynan similarly teaches a packet network. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to buffer data for an adjustable amount of time (by prior art) based upon a propagation delay or transmission latency (by prior art), in which the propagation delay is based on a test packet (by Drynan). The combination allows the system to compensate for propagation delay using a test packet.

27. Claims 34-35, 63-64 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoppal et al. (US 5,737,331) in view of Kudo et al. (US 5,148,429) as applied to claims 22, 45, 54 above, and further in view of Averbuch (US 5,268,933).

28. Re claim 34 (from claim 22) and claim 63 (from claim 54), the prior art may not specifically teach the spread spectrum technique. However, Averbuch teaches that the wireless packet network communicates using a direct sequence spread spectrum technique (direct sequence, Averbuch c1 40-44).

Averbuch is analogous to the prior art, because Averbuch similarly teaches digitized voice packets. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to communicate using a direct sequence spread spectrum (by Averbuch) in a communications network (by prior art) in order to modulate the signal data (Averbuch c1 11-37).

Art Unit: 2617

29. Re claim 35 (from claim 22) and claim 64 (from claim 54), Averbuch further teaches that the wireless packet network communicates using a frequency hopping spread spectrum technique (hopping, Averbuch c1 45-53).

30. Claims 33, 46, 62 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoppal et al. (US 5,737,331) in view of Kudo et al. (US 5,148,429) as applied to claims 22, 45, 54 above, and further in view of Smith et al. (US 5,796,772).

31. Re claim 33 (from claim 22), claim 46 (from claim 45), and claim 62 (from claim 54), the prior art teaches a wireless packet network, but the prior art does not particularly teach that the network communicates on a frequency of 2.4 GHz. Smith, on the other hand, teaches that the wireless packet network communicates at a frequency of approximately 2.4 gigahertz (Smith et al. abstract).

Smith is analogous to the prior art, because Smith similarly teaches digital voice systems. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to communicate on a frequency of with Smith's 2.4 GHz communication in a wireless network (by prior art) in order to carry digital voice (Smith et al. c1 61-4).

32. Claims 37-39, 51-53, 66-68 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoppal et al. (US 5,737,331) in view of Kudo et al. (US 5,148,429) as applied to claims 23, 49, 55 above, and further in view of Stein (US 5,628,055).

Art Unit: 2617

33. Re claim 37 (from claim 22), claim 51 (from claim 45), and claim 66 (from claim 54), the prior art does not specifically teach a removable circuit card. Despite this omission, Stein teaches a circuit card interface for accepting a removable circuit card (Stein Fig. 12).

Stein is analogous to the prior art, because Stein similarly teaches a digital voice cellular system. Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for a wireless network system (of prior art) to incorporate a removable circuit card (by Stein) in order to transmit and receive on a digital cellular radio network (Stein c1 46-9).

34. Re claim 38 (from claim 37), claim 52 (from claim 51), and claim 67 (from claim 66), Stein further teaches that the removable circuit card comprises a wired network interface card (modem for standard telecommunication network lines, Stein c2 10-17).

35. Re claim 39 (from claim 37), claim 53 (from claim 51), and claim 68 (from claim 66), Stein further teaches that the removable circuit card interface is compatible with the Personal Computer Memory Card Interface Association (PCMCIA) standard (Stein c1 25-45).

36. Claims 74-79 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoppal et al. (US 5,737,331) in view of Kudo et al. (US 5,148,429) as applied to claims 22, 45, 54 above, and further in view of Li et al. (US 5,617,423).

Art Unit: 2617

37. Re claim 77 (from claim 22), claim 78 (from claim 45), claim 79 (from claim 54), the prior art may not specifically state how the phone adjusts the amount of packetized digital voice data. However, Li teaches this limitation:

wherein the phone adjusts the amount of digital voice data packetized and transmitted over the wireless network (discarding silent frame packets, Li et al. c25 65-4), in accordance with a predetermined voice threshold (power PWR is lower than a preselected threshold, Li et al. c25 65-4).

Li is analogous to the prior art, because Li similarly teaches digitized voice. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adjust the amount of digital voice data in accordance with a predetermined voice threshold (by Li) in a wireless network (by prior art) in order to allocate the amount of voice digital information required to be transferred (Li et al. c5 33-39).

38. Re claim 74 (from claim 22), claim 75 (from claim 45), claim 76 (from claim 54), Li further teaches that the phone does not receive dedicated bandwidth on the wireless packet network for communication of packets containing digital voice data (by dynamically allocating bandwidth depending on the demands of the voice grade digitized signal, Li et al. c2 51-56).

Art Unit: 2617

39. Claims 80-85 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoppal et al. (US 5,737,331) in view of Kudo et al. (US 5,148,429) as applied to claims 22, 45, 54 above, and further in view of Haoui et al. (US 5,742,640).

40. Re claim 80 (of claim 22), claim 82 (of claim 45), and claim 84 (of claim 54), the prior art teaches transmitting digital voice data over a wireless packet network. The prior art does not specifically teach that the data is transmitted redundantly within 2 or more successive transmissions. However, Haoui teaches that the outgoing digital voice data (digitally encoded speech signals, Haoui et al. abstract) is transmitted redundantly (CRC and FEC, Haoui et al. c7 65-14) within two or more successive transmissions (data is interleaved over two time slots, Haoui et al. c8 7-10) over the wireless packet network (Haoui et al. Fig. 2).

Haoui is analogous to the prior art, because Haoui also teaches digitally encoded speech. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to redundantly transmit voice data over 2 or more successive transmission (by Haoui) in a wireless packet network (by prior art) in order to “protect the encoded speech signals during transmission” (Haoui et al. abstract).

41. Re claim 81 (of claim 80), claim 83 (of claim 82), and claim 85 (of claim 84), Haoui further teaches that outgoing digital voice data (digitally encoded speech signals, Haoui et al. abstract) is transmitted redundantly (CRC and FEC, Haoui et al. c7 65-14) within two or more successive transmissions (data is interleaved over two time slots, Haoui et al. c8 7-10) over the wireless packet network (Haoui et al. Fig. 2).

Response to Arguments

42. Applicant's arguments, see page 28, filed 3 November 2009, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 33, 46, 62 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Hoppal et al. (US 5,737,331) in view of Kudo et al. (US 5,148,429) as applied to claims 22, 45, 54 above, and further in view of Smith et al. (US 5,796,772).

43. Applicant's arguments, see page 29, filed 3 November 2009, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 37-39, 51-53, 66-68 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Hoppal et al. (US 5,737,331) in view of Kudo et al. (US 5,148,429) as applied to claims 23, 49, 55 above, and further in view of Stein (US 5,628,055).

44. Applicant's arguments, see page 23, filed 3 November 2009, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 74-79 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Hoppal et al. (US 5,737,331) in view of Kudo et al. (US 5,148,429) as applied to claims 22, 45, 54 above, and further in view of Li et al. (US 5,617,423).

45. Applicant's arguments filed 3 November 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

46. Re claim 22, 45, 54, the applicant argues that "the first voice stream is used to produce packets for transmission" and therefore "monitoring for a lack of speech for a minimum period of time" is done at the transmission end. As can be seen, Hoppal teaches that the voice/silence detector is performed at the transmission side (Hoppal et al. Fig. 9).

47. Re claim 36 is further clarified in the rejection.

48. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 27-29, 42-44, 57-58, 71-73 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Wang whose telephone number is (571)270-1214. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F 10 AM - 4 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on 571.272.7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/David Wang/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617
21 April 2010

/Patrick N. Edouard/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617